

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/807,661	06/15/2001	Klaus Titzschkau	14510	2239	
7590 05/02/2003 Scully Scott Murphy & Presser		EXAMINER			
400 Garden City, N			RAJGURU, U	RAJGURU, UMAKANT K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1711		
		DATE MAILED: 05/02/2003			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		DA	NB			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/807,661	TITZSCHKAU, KLAUS				
, ianos, y monen	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Umakant K. Rajguru	1711				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sh t with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 13 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the state of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.5 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ I 36(a) and the appropriate e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. ☑ A Notice of Appeal was filed on <i>Mar.</i> 28, 2003. A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			forth in			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>14-27</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						

NOTE: Said amendment changes the scope of the respective claims whereby new search for prior art is needed. Rejection may also have to be reconsidered.

James J. Seidleck Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1700